DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 224 TM 005 183

AUTHOR Alvir, Howard P.
TITLE Three Packets with Which to Evaluate Teacher In-Service Workshops via Participant Evaluation and via Observer Evaluation.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Occupational Education Research.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 31p.; For related document, see TM 005 181; Occasional light print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; *Guidelines; *Inservice Teacher Education; Questionnaires; Scoring; *Teacher Workshops; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Three evaluation packets which can serve as guidelines for evaluation models are illustrated in this document. These packages were designed originally for occupational educators, but editing can make these packets and evaluation forms applicable to any area in which secondary and post-secondary teachers attend an inservice workshop or training session. The first packet focuses on the evaluation of inservice workshops from the perspectives of participating teachers for use by occupational administrators and workshop directors. The second packet is aimed at improving the workshop component which is ranked as least successful. The final packet is geared toward evaluating inservice workshops from the viewpoint of observers. Instructions, sample questionnaires, and data analysis information accompany each packet. (DEP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120224

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM SP
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

TITLE

THREE PACKETS WITH WHICH TO EVALUATE TEACHER IN-SERVICE WORKSHOPS VIA PARTICIPANT EVALUATION AND VIA OBSERVER EVALUATION

Author

Howard P. ALVIR, Ph.D.
Bureau of Occupational Education Research
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TM005 183

FOR THE READER IN A HURRY

These three evaluation packets were designed originally for occupational educators.

However, a bit of editing can make these packets and evaluation forms applicable to any area in which secondary ahd post-secondary teachers attend an in-service workshop or training section.

These packets have been approved by New York State Education Department for use in evaluating funded workshops during the summer of 1976.

Fieldtests were conducted in the summer of 1975 in a different and unrevised version.

For more information, contact the author, Dr. Howard P. ALVIR.

PACKET 1

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

I N - S E R V I C E W O R K S H O P E V A L U A T I O N

BY PARTICIPANTS

Guidelines, Forms, and Analysis

Deadline: To be returned to the Bureau of Inservice Education within 5 days after the termination of the workshop.

University of the State of New York
New York State Education Department
Bureau of Inservice Education
Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Albany, New York 12234

PURPOSE

This document contains materials for occupational education administrators and workshop directors to use in evaluating inservice workshops from the viewpoint of participating teachers. Typical questions that can be answered with these materials are:

1) To what extent were the workshop objectives achieved?

2) To what extent were the workshop resources and activities helpful to achieve the workshop objectives?

3) To what extent did participants find the workshop to be practical?

4) Would this workshop be valuable for others in the field?

5) If the workshop is deemed repeatable, which components of the workshop need improvement?

These questions are answered through an analysis of FORM I participant scores; GT, ON, RA, and PA.

GT: GRAND TOTAL measures overall workshop effectiveness

ON: OBJECTIVES AND NEEDS ANALYSIS SUBTOTAL
measures the relative effectiveness of the workshop's objectives and needs analysis

RA: RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES SUBTOTAL
measures the relative effectiveness of the workshop's resources and activities

PA: PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS SUBTOTAL
measures the relative effectiveness of the workshop's practical applications

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

The person using these materials organizes the following:

The DUPLICATION and DISTRIBUTION of the evaluation form found on pages 3 and 4,

The COLLECTION of the completed evaluation forms, and

The PREPARATION of the tally as explained on pages 5-7 and summary scoring sheet as detailed on page 8.

A TABULATION of the Yes and No count for each question.

ID # = _____

FORM I

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOPS

OFFICE USE ONLY
ON = _____
RA = _____
PA = _____
GT = _____

DIRECTIONS: I. Identify the workshop and the dates of attendance.

Workshop: _____

Dates: _____

II. Circle YES or NO for each of the following. Comments may be added. Questions left blank, undecided, or answered with both YES and NO will automatically be tabulated as NO unless explained with a comment.

1.	I was made aware of the workshop objectives before I came to the workshop.	1. YES	NO
2.	The workshop objectives were clearly stated.	2. YES	NO
3.	The workshop objectives were related to my teaching concerns as an occupational educator.	3. YES	NO
4.	Most of this workshop centered around material that was interesting, challenging, and usable.	4. YES	NO
5.	The purpose and objectives of this workshop made sense to me.	5. YES	NO
6.	The workshop objectives were met to a high degree.	6. YES	NO
7.	This workshop should be held again with the same objectives for those of my colleagues who were unable to attend.	7. YES	NO
8.	This workshop should be held again for the same participants on a more advanced level.	8. YES	NO
9.	This workshop had some components which were unique or innovative.	9. YES	NO
10.	Most of the scheduled workshop activities made good use of the time available.	10. YES	NO

11.	Most presentations were well organized.	11. YES	NO
12.	Most workshop personnel (speakers, presenters, and resource persons) provided the kind of information, expertise, creativity, and communication skills expected by me as a participant.	12. YES	NO
13.	Most sessions offered stimulating or new material.	13. YES	NO
14.	My questions were dealt with satisfactorily.	14. YES	NO
15.	The workshop activities were appropriate for meeting the stated objectives.	15. YES	NO
16.	Instructional resources were appropriate and adequate for achievement of workshop objectives.	16. YES	NO
17.	There was evidence of good administrative practice in leadership and supervision on the part of the workshop director.	17. YES	NO
18.	Meeting room facilities were suitable.	18. YES	NO
19.	The physical environment was adequate as far as lodging, lighting, ventilation, parking, cafeteria, and other such things were concerned.	19. YES	NO
20.	This workshop was a successful training experience for me.	20. YES	NO
21.	The workshop content was practical and useful in helping improve classroom instruction.	21. YES	NO
22.	Reasonable progress was made by me individually towards meeting the objectives of the workshop.	22. YES	NO
23.	I had a chance to provide feedback to the workshop staff.	23. YES	NO
24.	I had a chance to identify professional needs which I previously had ignored.	24. YES	NO
25.	This workshop has some implications for the way I teach.	25. YES	NO
26.	The things I learned at this workshop will help the students I teach this coming year.	26. YES	NO
27.	Overall, this workshop was a worthwhile and valuable experience.	27. YES	NO
28.	I am able to list specific benefits I received at this workshop.	28. YES	NO

TALLY DIRECTIONS FOR FORMS ENTITLED PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOPS

STEP 1 COMPUTE ON, RA, PA, and GT for each form

and

PLACE these scores in the appropriate space in the OFFICE USE area

NOTE: To compute these scores, count one (1) point for each YES circled.

ON = the count for questions 1-8
RA = the count for questions 9-20
PA = the count for questions 21-28
GT = ON + RA + PA

STEP 2 After all the individual forms for a specific workshop have been computed as described above,

PLACE the individual form in numerical order according to GT, with the highest GT count on top and with the lowest GT count on the bottom.

and then

ASSIGN a number to each form in the OFFICE USE area where the number (#) symbol appears. For example, number the highest GT count with "# = 1," the next highest with "# = 2," and so on. Ignore tie scores. Continue numbering in chronological order. For example, if two forms are tied for 1st place, number one of them with "# = 1," and the other with "# = 2" and continue to number.

TRANSCRIBE the ON, RA, PA, and GT counts in the appropriate spaces on the TALLY SCORING SHEET (pp.6-7). If there are more than 50 participants evaluating, use an extra page or pages.

STEP 3 PROCEED to SUMMARY SCORING SHEET (p. 8).

WORKSHOP IDENTIFICATION DATA

Line 1: Name of Workshop: ______________________

Line 2: Dates of Workshop: ______________________

Line 3: Number of participants evaluating workshop: ______________

Line 4: Number of participants attending workshop: ______________

Line 5: Percent of participants evaluating workshop: ______________%

NOTE: ON = Objectives and Needs Analysis
RA = Resources and Activities
PA = Practical Applications
GT = Grand Total

TALLY SCORING SHEETS

Participant #	ON Subtotal	RA Subtotal	PA Subtotal	Grand Total
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Participant #	ON Subtotal	RA Subtotal	PA Subtotal	Grand Total
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
49				
49				
50				

8

SUMMARY SCORING SHEET FOR
PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TEACHER WORKSHOPS

SUMMARY OF TALLY SHEET TOTALS OF GT, ON, RA, PA

Total of GT	Total of ON Subtotal	Total of RA Subtotal	Total of PA Subtotal

The total number of participant evaluators for this workshop is _____.

Divide the above by the total number of participant evaluators. Place the results below:

AVERAGE OF TOTALS OF GT, ON, RA, PA

Average GT	Average ON	Average RA	Average

Divide Average GT by 28
Divide Average ON by 8
Divide Average RA by 12
Divide Average PA by 8

} Place the results below:

PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESS

GT Success	ON Success	RA Success	PA Success
%	%	%	%

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS' PROFILE
(RANK OF SUCCESS)

Circle highest, average, or lowest below according to the above percentages.

ON%	RA%	PA%
Highest	Highest	Highest
Average	Average	Average
Lowest	Lowest	Lowest

ANALYSIS

1. The highest percentage identifies the most successful component of the workshop.
2. The lowest percentage identifies the workshop component most in need of improvement.

PACKET 2

OPTIONAL SUPPLEMENT TO
OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP EVALUATION

BY PARTICIPANTS

Forms to Improve the Component Ranked as Least Successful

This optional supplement may be used as part of the required narrative description of the workshop

University of the State of New York
New York State Education Department
Bureau of Inservice Education
Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Albany, New York 12234

IMPROVING THE COMPONENT RANKED AS LEAST SUCCESSFUL

In order to improve the workshop component ranked as least successful, either ON, RA, or PA, the following procedures may be employed:

PROCEDURE:

I: Perform an item by item analysis of each evaluation question by completing FORM IBIA found on pages 2-3.

II: Analyze any comments for the questions which are rated LOW on FORM IBIA. When the lowest rating on FORM IBIA is average, analyze the comments associated with the average rating. This comment analysis can be done by completing FORM CA found on pages 4-5.

III: Synthesize the results of FORM IBIA and FORM CA by answering the questions contained on FORM OQ found on pages 6-7.

IV: Summarize on a separate piece of paper a list of things to be changed or done differently the next time the workshop is repeated. Page 8 may be used.

V: Develop a narrative evaluation on the basis of the above four procedures and other pertinent data. Page 8 may be used here also.

FORM IBIA

(ITEM BY ITEM ANALYSIS)

DIRECTIONS:

STEP 1: In column 1, question by question, TALLY, the total number of YES responses.

STEP 2: In column 2, question by question, TALLY, the total number of NO responses.

STEP 3: In column 3, question by question, DO one of the following:

a) CIRCLE HIGH if the positive response is approximately a two-thirds majority.

b) CIRCLE LOW if the negative response is approximately a two-thirds majority.

c) CIRCLE AVERAGE if the group reaction is approvimately equal.

NOTE: When substeps a, b, and c result in only HIGH or AVERAGE being circled, go back over the data in column 2 to identify the largest three NO tallies. In column 3, circle LOW to identify these three tallies for analysis on FORM CA.

QUESTION #	COLUMN 1 YES	COLUMN 2 NO	COLUMN 3 MAJORITY VOTE		
1			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
2			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
3			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
4			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
5			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
6			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
7			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
8			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
9			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
10			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
11			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
12			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
13			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
14			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
15			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
16			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
17			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
18			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
19			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
20			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
21			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
22			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
23			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
24			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
25			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
26			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
27			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
28			HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW

SECTION ON SECTION RA SECTION PA

FORM CA

(COMMENTS ANALYSIS)

DIRECTIONS:

STEP 1: In the space marked (A), for each question rated LOW on FORM IBIA, type or write the question number. In the space marked (B), type or write the text of the question as it appears on the form given to evaluators.

STEP 2: In the appropriate column YES, NO, or DID NOT FOLLOW DIRECTIONS, type or write the comment(s) made. Before each comment, type or write the I.D. number found in the upper right hand corner (for example, # = ____) of each participants form. When the comments for a particular question are too numerous to fit on FORM CA, EITHER use a separate piece of paper divided into three columns for this analysis OR the sample form found on page 6.

(A) Question # ____	(B) Text of Question:	
COMMENTS MADE BY EVALUATORS WHO		
CIRCLED "YES"	CIRCLED "NO"	DID NOT FOLLOW DIRECTIONS

(A) Question # ____	(B) Text of Question:	
CIRCLED "YES"	CIRCLED "NO"	DID NOT FOLLOW DIRECTIONS

FORM CA
(Many Comments)

(A) Question # _____	(B) Text of Question:

COMMENTS MADE BY EVALUATORS WHO

CIRCLED "YES"	CIRCLED "NO"	DID NOT FOLLOW DIRECTIONS

FORM OQ

(OVERVIEW QUESTIONS)

DIRECTIONS

STEP 1: Circle YES or NO to answer the following overview questions.

If, in your opinion, a question is not applicable, circle NA.

STEP 2: Add up the number of YES answers.

STEP 3: If the number of YES answers exceeds six, the workshop director has enough information with which to improve the weakest component of the workshop being evaluated.

STEP 4: If the number of YES answers is less than seven, the workshop director needs to look elsewhere than this evaluation to find out what needs to be done to improve the weakest component of the workshop being evaluated.

YES NO NA 1. FORM IBIA as filled out for the workshop being evaluated pinpoints a number of questions that received a LOW or AVERAGE rating.

YES NO NA 2. Most of these questions that received a LOW or AVERAGE rating seem to cluster in the same component.

YES NO NA 3. Most of these questions referred to above tended to cluster in the ON section, that is, questions 1 - 8.

YES NO NA 4. Most of these questions referred to above tended to cluster in the RA section, that is, questions 9 - 20.

YES NO NA 5. Most of these questions referred to above tended to cluster in the PA section, that is, questions 21 - 28.

YES NO NA 6. Some of the low rated questions referred to above had a number of comments.

YES NO NA 7. Many of the comments explained the point of view of the participant evaluators.

YES NO NA 8. At least one of the questions had enough comments to require the use of a separate page.

YES NO NA 9. On FORM CA, some of the comments contained in the YES column contained positive suggestions on how to improve specific workshop details.

YES NO NA 10. On FORM CA, some of the comments contained in the NO column contained positive suggestions on how to improve specific workshop details.

YES NO NA 11. On FORM CA, some of the comments contained in the DID NOT FOLLOW DIRECTIONS column contained positive suggestions on how to improve specific workshop details.

YES NO NA 12. After the workshop, some of the participants came forward with concrete suggestions.

YES NO NA 13. After the workshop, some of the participants volunteered to help out planning possible repeats or continuations of the workshop.

YES NO NA 14. After the workshop, some of the staff came forward with positive suggestions and offers of assistance.

YES NO NA 15. After the workshop, some of the external observers came forward with specific positive suggestions.

YES NO NA 16. Reflections, discussions, and analyses made of FORM IBIA and of FORM CA, have given the workshop director a number of specific ideas of improvement that can be made.

YES NO NA 17. The grand total success percentage of the workshop was above 75 percent.

YES NO NA 18. More than 75 percent of the participants at the workshop completed an evaluation form.

TOTAL YES = _____

TOTAL NO = _____

TOTAL NA = _____

Name of Workshop: _____

_____

Dates of Workshop: _____

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

DIRECTIONS: In your style, format, and/or design, describe your workshop as it relates to your original proposal. Attach as many sheets as necessary to complete this task.

PACKET 3

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

I N - S E R V I C E W O R K S H O P E V A L U A T I O N

BY OBSERVERS

Guidelines, Forms, and Analysis

Deadline: To be returned to the Bureau of Inservice Education within 5 days after the termination of the workshop.

University of the State of New York
New York State Education Department
Bureau of Inservice Education
Bureau of Occupational Education Research
Albany, New York 12234

PURPOSE

This document contains materials for occupational education administrators and workshop directors to use in evaluating inservice workshops from the viewpoint of observers. Typical questions that can be answered with these materials are:

(1) To what extent were the workshop objectives achieved from the viewpoint of external observers?

(2) To what extent did the workshop resources and activities appear helpful in achieving the workshop objectives?

(3) To what extent did external observers rate the workshop to be practical?

(4) Would this workshop be valuable for others in the field according to the opinion of external observers?

(5) If the workshop is deemed repeatable, which components of the workshop need improvement in the eyes of experienced observers?

These questions are answered through an analysis of the following scores: GT, ON, RA, and PA.

GT: GRAND TOTAL measures overall workshop effectiveness

ON: OBJECTIVES AND NEEDS ANALYSIS SUBTOTAL
measures the relative effectiveness of the workshop's objectives and needs analysis.

RA: RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES SUBTOTAL
measures the relative effectiveness of the workshop's resources and activities

PA: PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS SUBTOTAL
measures the relative effectiveness of the workshop's practical applications

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

The person using these materials organizes the following:

The DUPLICATION and DISTRIBUTION of the evaluation form found on pages 3 and 4,

The COLLECTION of the completed evaluation forms, and

The PREPARATION of the tally as explained on pages 5-7, the scoring sheet as detailed on pages 8-11, and the summary on page 12.

A TABULATION of the Yes and No count for each question.

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE WORKSHOP

OFFICE USE ONLY
ON = ___; NA = ___
RA = ___; NA ___
PA = ___; NA = ___
GT = ___: NA = ___

DIRECTIONS:

A. Identify workshop, dates, and activity observed.

Workshop Name _____

Date(s) Attended _____

Activity Observed ☐ Entire Workshop ☐ Portion of Workshop

(Specify) _____

OFFICE USE ONLY
ON = ___
RA = ___
PA = ___
GT = ___

B. Identify self by checking all descriptions that apply.

☐ BISE ☐ W.S. Director ☐ Staff ☐ SED ☐ Specialist ☐ Other: _____

C. Circle "yes" or "no" for each of the following. Comments should be added either on this form or on a separate piece of paper. Circle NA when "yes" or "no" would be inappropriate, not applicable, or not observable.

NOTE: The words, "during my observation" and "during the workshop" are assumed in all the following questions even when not repeated. When only one or two workshop sessions have been observed, "workshop session(s)" are assumed in place of "workshop."

1. I had enough observation time to form a valid impression of the quality of this workshop (or workshop session).	1. NA YES NO
2. I had sufficient opportunity to talk informally to participants.	2. NA YES NO
3. I was made aware of the workshop objectives prior to my observations.	3. NA YES NO
4. The objectives of the workshop seemed clear to most participants during my observations.	4. NA YES NO
5. In general, most participants seem to achieve the workshop objectives.	5. NA YES NO
6. Ideas and suggestions presented to the group by the director or staff were discussed, explored, and evaluated.	6. NA YES NO
7. Participants seemed to be sensitive to the needs and concern of each other as being worthwhile and related to workshop objectives.	7. NA YES NO
8. Workshop staff seemed to help participants confront differences openly and objectively.	8. NA YES NO
9. Participants seemed to respond positively to the professional leadership of the workshop director.	9. NA YES NO
10. Participants seemed to respond positively to the professional leadership of the workshop staff.	10. NA YES NO
11. Most of the participants seemed to take an active interest in the workshop activities.	11. NA YES NO
12. Participants appeared comfortable professionally.	12. NA YES NO

- OVER -

13. Participants appeared comfortable physically. 13. NA YES NO

14. The overall participant response to the workshop seemed positive. 14. NA YES NO

15. The physical environment was adequate as far as meeting room facilities, lodging, lighting, ventilation, parking, cafeteria, and other such things are concerned. 15. NA YES NO

16. The presentation methods used seemed appropriate to the subject matter, purposes, and objectives of the workshop. 16. NA YES NO

17. The presentation methods used seemed sufficient to maintain participant interest. 17. NA YES NO

18. The hardware resources demonstrated in the workshop seemed to be available to most participants in their home schools. 18. NA YES NO

19. Participants seemed to utilize to a high degree hardware resources available during the workshop. 19. NA YES NO

20. Participants seemed to perceive workshop objectives, evaluations, and resources as coordinated and interrelated. 20. NA YES NO

21. Participants seemed to have an opportunity that I witnessed to pinpoint the weak spots in the workshop in order to improve future workshops. 21. NA YES NO

22. Participants seemed actually to pinpoint during my observations specific weak spots in the workshop in order to improve future workshops. 22. NA YES NO

23. Participants seemed to have an opportunity to identify the strong parts of the workshop for future recycling. 23. NA YES NO

24. Participants actually identified the strong parts of the workshop for future recycling. 24. NA YES NO

25. Activities observed were explicitly related by the presenter(s) to implications for teachers in the classroom setting. 25. NA YES NO

26. Participants seemed to translate workshop objectives into specific learning strategies. 26. NA YES NO

27. Opportunity was present for participants to interact informally with presenter(s) either before or after presentations. 27. NA YES NO

28. Opportunity was given to the participants to raise questions during the workshop. 28. NA YES NO

29. Participants anticipated difficulties to be encountered at home schools while trying to implement skills and competencies newly acquired as a result of workshop objectives. 29. NA YES NO

30. Participants actually <u>discussed</u> and <u>planned</u> things they were going to do differently as a result of the workshop. 30. NA YES NO

31. On the whole, this workshop was of better than average quality as far as practical classroom applications are concerned. 31. NA YES NO

TALLY DIRECTIONS
FOR FORMS ENTITLED
OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF TEACHER INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

STEP 1: COMPUTE ON, RA, PA, and GT together with the associated NA score for each form.

and

Place these scores in the appropriate spaces in the OFFICE USE area.

NOTE: To compute ON, RA, and PA, count one point for each YES circled.

To compute the associated NA score, count one point for each NA circled.

ON = the count for questions 3-12
RA = the count for questions 6-20
PA = the count for questions 17-31
GT = ON + RA + PA

NOTE: It is to be noted that several of the questions are counted in more than one score because of content overlap and that questions 1 and 2 are not tabulated in the above counts.

STEP 2: COMPUTE the ON, RA, PA, and GT percentages of success with the following formulae by using the tables on pages 6-7.

and

Place these percentages in the appropriate spaces in the OFFICE USE area (p.3) on each form for evantual use on the profile form (p.10).

Formulae	Sample Scores	Sample Calculation
$ON\ \% = \frac{ON}{10 - NA}$	ON = 8 NA = 1	$ON\ \% = \frac{8}{10 - 1} = \frac{8}{9} = 89\%$
$RA\ \% = \frac{RA}{15 - NA}$	RA = 11 NA = 4	$RA\ \% = \frac{11}{15 - 4} = \frac{11}{11} = 100\%$
$PA\ \% = \frac{PA}{15 - NA}$	PA = 13 NA = 0	$PA\ \% = \frac{13}{15 - 0} = \frac{13}{15} = 87\%$
$GT\ \% = \frac{ON + RA + PA}{40 - NA - NA - NA}$	Use above scores	$GT\ \% = \frac{8 + 11 + 13}{40 - 1 - 4 - 0}$ $GT\ \% = \frac{32}{35} = 91\%$

SUMMARY TABLE OF
PERCENTAGES FOR $\frac{X}{Y}$ = Z%

DIRECTIONS: For any fraction $\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)$ to be transformed, locate the numerator (the x-value) in the horizontal row across the top and then go down the x-column until opposite the denominator (the y-value). The value listed is Z% which is equal to $\frac{x}{y}$.

DENOMINATOR - THE-Y-VALUE	NUMERATOR - THE-X-VALUE															
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1		100														
2		50	100													
3		33	67	100												
4		25	50	75	100											
5		20	40	60	80	100										
6		17	33	50	67	83	100									
7		14	29	43	57	71	86	100								
8		13	25	38	50	63	75	88	100							
9		11	22	33	44	56	67	78	89	100						
10		10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100					
11		9	18	27	36	46	55	64	73	82	91	100				
12		8	17	25	33	42	50	58	67	75	83	92	100			
13		8	15	23	31	39	46	54	62	69	77	85	92	100		
14		7	14	21	29	36	43	50	57	64	71	79	86	93	100	
15		7	13	20	27	33	40	47	53	60	67	73	80	87	93	100

SUMMARY TABLE OF PERCENTAGES FOR $\frac{X}{Y}$ = Z%

DIRECTIONS: For any fraction $\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)$ to be transformed, locate the numerator (the x-value) in the horizontal row across the top and then go down the x-column until opposite the denominator (the y-value). The value listed is Z% which is equal to $\frac{x}{y}$.

For values not listed, divide x by y to obtain the percentage or write "less than 46%".

NUMERATOR - THE-X-VALUE

DENOMINATOR - THE-Y-VALUE	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
16	100																			
17	94	100																		
18	89	94	100																	
19	84	90	95	100																
20	80	85	90	95	100															
21	76	81	86	91	95	100														
22	73	77	82	86	91	95	100													
23	70	74	78	83	87	91	96	100												
24	67	71	75	79	83	88	92	96	100											
25	64	68	72	76	80	84	88	92	96	100										
26	62	65	69	73	77	81	85	89	92	96	100									
27	59	63	67	70	74	78	82	85	89	93	96	100								
28	57	61	64	68	71	75	79	82	86	89	93	97	100							
29	55	59	62	66	69	72	76	79	83	86	90	93	97	100						
30	53	57	60	63	67	70	73	77	80	83	87	90	93	97	100					
31	52	55	58	61	65	68	71	74	77	81	84	87	90	94	97	100				
32	50	53	56	59	63	66	69	72	75	78	81	84	88	91	94	97	100			
33	49	52	55	58	61	64	67	70	73	76	79	82	85	88	91	94	97	100		
34	47	50	53	56	59	62	65	68	71	74	76	79	82	85	88	91	94	97	100	
35	46	49	51	54	57	60	63	66	68	71	74	77	80	83	86	89	91	94	97	100

ANALYZING THE OBSERVERS' PERCENTAGES OF SUCCESS TO DEVELOP THE OBSERVERS' EVALUATION PROFILE

STEP 1: Identify the highest and the lowest percentage of success.

If there is a 15 percentage point difference between the high score and the low score, place an H after the high score and an L after the low score. (For example, look at the scores for observer A on the next page.)

STEP 2: Identify any scores within 5 points of the high score and mark these scores also with an H. (For example, look at the scores for observer B.)

STEP 3: Identify any scores within 5 points of the low score and mark these scores also with an L. (For example, look at the scores for observer C.)

STEP 4: Ignore H and L scoring for any percentages of success which have less than 10 percentage points difference between the high score and the low score. (For example, look at the scores for observer D.)

STEP 5: Add up the H and L count for each column.

STEP 6: Inspect the H and L totals for each column in order to determine which component (ON, RA, or PA) received the highest ranking and the lowest ranking. When such a decision is not evident from an inspection of the H and L totals, the workshop director should seek help in making this decision by showing the H and L totals to others for an objective rating.

STEP 7: Record the above highest and lowest ranking on the chart below by circling the appropriate ranking. (In the example illustrated on page 9, ON receives the HIGHEST ranking while RA receives the LOWEST ranking. Thus, PA receives the AVERAGE ranking.)

P R O F I L E

ON%	RA%	PA%
HIGHEST	HIGHEST	HIGHEST
AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE
LOWEST	LOWEST	LOWEST

STEP 8: Compare the ranking of the observers form as recorded above with the ranking of the participants form as recorded in packet 1. Be ready to explain any differences in the final rankings.

NOTE: The following illustrative data is used to provide examples of the preceding eight steps.

ILLUSTRATIVE DATA

OBSERVER ID#	ON%	RA%	PA%	GT%
A	94 H	78 L	88	
B	96 H	81 L	94 H	
C	95 H	79 L	82 L	
D	95	89	87	
E	97 H	82 L	89	
F	91 H	71 L	89 H	
G	75 L	92 H	79 L	
H	88	86	90	
TOTAL	H = 5	H = 1	H = 2	
	L = 1	L = 5	L = 2	

GT is not analyzed in this example

P R O F I L E

DATA ANALYSIS (SAMPLE BASED ON ABOVE)

ON%	RA%	PA%
(Highest)	Highest	Highest
Average	Average	(Average)
Lowest	(Lowest)	Lowest

Ranking

OBSERVERS' RANKING

ON%	RA%	PA%
(H)	H	H
A	A	(A)
L	(L)	L

Meaning

The highest ranking component of the workshop is ON, that is, the objectives and needs analysis.

The lowest ranking component of the workshop is RA, that is, the resources and activities.

Conclusion: The objectives, needs analysis, and practical applications were acceptable, BUT the workshop resources and activities were NOT as acceptable.

Note: Go to page 11 for sample comparisons with participant data.

DEVELOPING THE OBSERVERS' EVALUATION PROFILE

DIRECTIONS: A completed example of the following steps is found on page 9.

STEP 1: Fill in the percentages for ON, RA, and PA according to the directions found on page 5.

STEP 2: Add on the H and L identification symbols as explained on page 8.

STEP 3: Total the H and L symbols for each column as done in the example on page 9.

STEP 4: Develop the OBSERVERS' EVALUATION PROFILE below by circling highest, average, and lowest according to the results of STEP 3.

STEP 5: Compare the OBSERVERS' EVALUATION PROFILE with the PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION PROFILE (which results from the use of PACKET 1) according to the examples found on page 11.

WORKSHOP DATA

OBSERVER ID#	ON %	RA %	PA %	GT %
TOTAL	H =	H =	H =	
	L =	L =	L =	

P R O F I L E

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION (BASED ON THE ABOVE DATA)

ON%	RA%	PA%
Highest	Highest	Highest
Average	Average	Average
Lowest	Lowest	Lowest

From the data on page 10, comparisons should be made and conclusions drawn.

Sample comparisons and conclusions are presented in two columns below, namely, RANKING and MEANING.

Ranking	Meaning
PARTICIPANTS' RANKING (Sample #1) ON% RA% PA% (H) H H A (A) A L L (L)	According to the data in sample #1, participants agree with observers that the ON (Objectives and Needs Analysis) components were acceptable. However, the participants felt that the practical applications were less acceptable than the resources and activities. Conclusion: Try to improve both the RA (Resources and Activities) and the PA (Practical Applications) components of the workshop if it is to be repeated.
PARTICIPANTS' RANKING (Sample #2) ON% RA% PA% H (H) H A A (A) (L) L L	According to the data in sample #2, there is a direct opposition between the ranking of observers and participants. For some reason or other, what the observers perceived to be of high quality was perceived to be of lower quality by the participants. Conclusion: Investigate why there is this difference between observers and participants.
PARTICIPANTS' RANKING (Sample #3) ON% RA% PA% H H (H) (A) A A L (L) L	According to the data in sample #3, the observers and participants are in substantial agreement. The observers rated ON high and the participants rated ON average. This constitutes substantial agreement. Both the observers and the participants ranked RA as the lowest component. Conclusion: The RA (Resources and Activities) component definitely needs improvement.
PARTICIPANTS' RANKING (Sample #4) ON% RA% PA% H (H) H (A) A A L L (L)	According to the data in sample #4, both participants and observers are in agreement that the objectives and needs analysis are acceptable. The observers rated RA as low while the participants rated RA as high. The reverse situation holds for PA. Conclusion: Find out why there is a difference between the rankings of observers and participants as far as RA and PA are concerned.

SUMMARY SCORING SHEET

OBSERVERS' EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS AT WORKSHOP

1. Workshop Title: _____

2. Workshop Dates: _____

3. Number of Participants Who Evaluated ☐

4. Number of Participants at Workshop ☐

5. Percent of Participants Who Evaluated ☐ %

6. Number of Observers Who Evaluated ☐

7. Number of Observers at Workshop ☐

8. Percent of Observers Who Evaluated ☐ %

9. Number of Observers Who Evaluated Entire Workshop ☐

10. Percent of Observers Who Evaluated Entire Workshop ☐ %

11. PARTICIPANTS' RANKING PROFILE (from Packet 1)

ON %	RA %	PA %
Highest	Highest	Highest
Average	Average	Average
Lowest	Lowest	Lowest

12. OBSERVERS' RANKING PROFILE (from Packet 3)

ON %	RA %	PA %
Highest	Highest	Highest
Average	Average	Average
Lowest	Lowest	Lowest

13. The Workshop Component(s) Needing Improvement: (Circle all that Apply).

ON	RA	PA
Objectives and Needs Analysis	Resources and Activities	Practical Applications

14. Conclusions Based Upon Analyzing Sections 3-13 Above: (Explain in your own words, style, and format.)